DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 187 948 CE 025 668

AUTHOR McGough, Robert; And Others
TITLE Regional Workshops on CETA/Educational Linkages.
INSTITUTION Governor's Employment and Training Council, Richmond, Va.; Virginia Polytechnic Inst. and State Univ., Blacksburg. Div. of Vocational-Technical Education.
PUB DATE Sep 79
NOTE 63p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Cooperation; *Articulation (Education); *Community Colleges; *Educational Cooperation; Educational Planning; Federal Programs; *Proprietary Schools; *School Districts; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Virginia

ABSTRACT

This document presents a summary of the proceedings of five regional workshops in Virginia which focused on planning for future involvement and linkages, as well as giving an orientation to the capabilities and operational philosophies of both Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) programs and educational organizations. Following presentation of workshop rationale and overview, the first section focuses on the development of linkages between proprietary schools and community based organizations and CETA agencies. Among the issues identified are that CETA agencies do not have a clear understanding as to the types of programs and services that proprietary schools can offer. Section 2 presents issues, strategies, and recommendations for the development of linkages between community colleges and CETA agencies. A major issue discussed is the lack of apparent stability associated with CETA funds which make long range planning at community colleges difficult. A final section focuses on CETA's relationship with local education agencies. Among the concerns identified in this section are (1) negative CETA publicity, (2) differing fiscal years, (3) CETA philosophy of being concerned only with economically unemployed, and (4) CETA emphasis on short term skill training. Appended is a list of workshop participants and a summary evaluation. (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED187948

Regional Workshops on CETA/Education Linkages

Proceedings of Five Regional Workshops

Springfield, VA
July 9-10, 1979

Charlottesville, VA
July 19-20, 1979

Williamsburg, VA
August 20-21, 1979

Danville, VA
August 23-24, 1979

Roanoke, VA
September 10-11, 1979

Governor's Employment and Training Council

CE 025 668

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

A.H. Scherer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

governor's employment and training council

REGIONAL WORKSHOPS ON CETA/EDUCATION LINKAGES

Robert L. McGough

K. Kurt Eschenmann

Max Wortman

Staff:

Katherine Manley

Paul Combs

Robert Manley

Sponsored By:

Governor's Employment and Training Council, Richmond, VA, and
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University in cooperation
with the Division of Vocational and Technical Education

September 1979

******

The opinions expressed herein do not necessariiy reflect the policy of the Governor's Employment and Training Council, and no official endorsement by the Governor's Employment and Training Council should be inferred.

******

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Acknowledgements	vii
II.	Introductions	1
	Description of Workshop Process	
III.	Issues, Strategies and Recommendations for the Developement Of Linkages between Proprietary Schools and Community Based Organizations and CETA agencies	7
IV.	Issues, Strategies and Recommendations for the Development of Linkages between Community Colleges and CETA agencies	17
V.	Issues, Strategies and Recommendations for the Development of Linkages between Local Education Agencies and CETA Agencies	27
VI.	Summary	37
VII.	Appendix	43
	Appendix A--Workshop Participants	43
	Proprietary Schools and Community Based Organizations	45
	CETA Professionals	47
	State Advisory Council on Vocational Education	50
	Community Colleges	51
	Local Education Agencies	54
	State Department of Education	61
	Appendix B--Summary Evaluation	65

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to those counties, local education agencies, community colleges, proprietary schools, community based organizations, and CETA professionals participating in the five regional workshops. In particular, we would like to thank those persons for the time and consideration afforded us before, during and after the workshops. Needless to say, their cooperation made our job much easier and undoubtedly contributed to the overwhelming success of the workshops. Similarly, the project staff would like to express their appreciation to the participating consultants and resource persons. No small amount of credit should be given to this fine group of unusually talented professionals. Special recognition should be given to the Co-Director, Dr. K. Kurt Eschenmann, Ms. Kitty Manley, Mr. Bill Combs, and Mr. Bob Manley, who so ably developed many of the components of the workshops. As the Project Director, I would like to personally salute their conscientiousness, tolerance, and excellent performance. Additional thanks are extended to the following persons for their role in the initiation, follow-through, and facilitations of the five regional workshops associated with this project: Ms. Pat Walsh, Governor's Employment and Training Council: Dr. Mel Garner, State Director of Vocational Education: Mr. George Scherer, Director, Governor's Employment and Training Council: Mr. Ron Chandler, Supervisor, Employment and Training Services, State Department of Education; and Mr. George S. Orr, Virginia State Advisory Council on Vocational Education.

Further, deep gratitute is extended to the members of the planning committee for their dedication to the workshop in both planning and the program phases of the project. These persons are:

Ms. Flo Armstrong
Virginia State Department of Education

Mr. Paul Clancey
Peninsula Office of Manpower Programs

Mr. Wendell Coleman
Woodrow Wilson Vocational Rehabilitation Center

Mr. Len Ferrara
Balance-of-State (CETA)

Mr. Michael Gilbert
Northern Virginia Manpower Consotium

Mr. Jerry Hardy
Vocational Education Director

Mrs. Alicia Lugo
Central Virginia OIC

Mr. Richard Hunt
Genral Electric Company

Mr. Keith Lindgren
National Alliance of Business

Dr. Samuel Morgan
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Mr. Wade Morrison
Northern Virginia Skills Center

Mr. Robert Phelps
Bureau of Planning and Policy Development

Dr. Robert Sullins
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

Ms. Lois Wells,
Virginia Community College System

Mr. Herb Wittersheim
Automovtive Training Institue, INC.

The Project Director also wishes to express his appreciation for

the wise council and support of the many prime sponsor directors who contributed so much to the effectiveness of this project. Their efforts in the development and conceptualization of the project activities made it possible for Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to host this important activity. Finally the Project Director wishes to express his appreciation to the Governor's Employment and Training Council for providing the financial support that made these workshops possible. The council's continued support is growing evidence of the commitment of a sensitive and responsive state government to the needs of special populations in local communities.

Robert L. McGough
Project Director

INTRODUCTION

Recent legislation has added section 202(D) funds to Title II of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA). The purpose of these funds was to "...encourage coordination and the establishment of linkages between prime sponsors and appropriate educational agencies and institutions, and institutions providing training programs which are approved by the Secretary and for services for eligible participants delivered jointly by employment and training agenices and appropriate agencies and institutions." This aspect of CETA legislation has been noted nationally for several years with several cooperative efforts having been made to reduce the redundancy and overlap of programs conducted by various educational agencies and CETA. Likewise, during the past several years an increased awareness has developed, in part, to the emerging realities of the common goals of the above mentioned organizations and to the diversity of facilities and resources which are available within a local area. Many times, vocational programs and other types of training organizations will have facilities to train persons with special needs, but will not have the financial resources to support a major training effort in that area. Conversely, CETA, in many cases, may have the financial resources to support a major program but will not have access to the required equipment and facilities to do an adequate job. Because of the short-term funding patterns of CETA programs, it is not feasible to build and equip major training facilities which may be inappropriate after a few cycles of trainees are impacted. For this reason, it is important that CETA programs (prime sponsors and Balance-of-State), vocational education

programs, and other educational agencies realize the wisdom and necessity of cooperatively planning for future activities whereby mutual coordination of resources can be more effectively realized.

For the above mentioned reasons, the Governor's Employment and Training Council of Virginia issued a request for proposals (RFP) for five regional workshops to be conducted during the period from April 1, 1979 to September 30, 1979. These workshops were designed to build upon regionally conducted HEW national workshops on CETA/ Education Linkages that had been held the previous year. The proposed workshops were to focus upon activities that would allow maximum participant involvement and would place a premium on the establishment of a foundation for long-term CETA-Education relationships. In response to the RFP, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Division of Vocational and Technical Education, proposed that five regional CETA/Education linkage workshops be conducted throughout the Commonwealth of Virginia to provide an intensive orientation and inservice program to Employment and Training personnel and educators from the public and private sectors who desire to become more actively involved in the cooperatively sponsored programs currently being conducted and funded through the CETA-YEDPA legislation. It was proposed that the five regional workshops be conducted at the following sites: Roanoke, Virginia; Charlottesville, Virginia: Arlington, Virginia; Williamsburg, Virginia; and Danville, Virginia. These sites were chosen to provide the most economical and efficient/cost-benefit ratios of the participants' time and financial resources. The workshops were focused on planning for future involvement and linkages, as well as giving an orientation to the capabilities and

operational philosophies of both CETA and educational organizations within the designated regional areas. Also presented in the workshops were examples of methods and techniques that had proven successful in developing and maintaining linkages between CETA and educational organizations. The workshops were participatory in nature and the participants were actively involved in decision-making and planning for the future. In each regional workshop, prime sponsors and representatives of the various community agencies being served by that particular prime sponsor area were asked to participate. These participants included the following: CETA prime sponsors, local education agencies, proprietary schools, community colleges, state education agencies, community based organizations, AFL/CIO representatives, vocational education directors, and CETA project directors. The CETA-Education workshops were initially planned by a CETA/Education advisory committee (See page x for a detailed listing of the advisory committee members). The workshops were conducted with the aid of a professional process consultant who supported the planning activities of the participants. Each workshop was monitored and evaluated for possible modifications by VPI & SU and others as it was deemed appropriate (See Appendix B for a summary evaluation of the workshop).

The actual format for each workshop conducted varied depending upon the unique regional perspectives identified prior to the workshop activities by the project staff. Although the process varied somewhat, the workshop activities included presentations by both CETA and vocational education organizations that served to point out the perceived differences and similarities between these organizations and

to make specific recommendations which might be considered. Also included in each workshop was a process whereby the identification, clarification, and resolution of potential barriers to communication and coordination of efforts could be considered. An effort was made to involve the participants in detailed regional and local discussions with their linkage counterparts. These discussions were designed to foster and promote future agreements that would be implemented after the workshops had been completed. Also included in each workshop were presentations and activities which served to enhance the participant's understanding of successful methods and techniques whereby CETA programs and projects could be develped and maintained with high levels of quality and effectiveness. Finally, a preceedings document, this document, was developed to provide a documentation and dissemination of the information developed by the workshop participants to other CETA and educational professionals within the Commonwealth of Virginia.

ISSUES, STRATEGIES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LINKAGES BETWEEN PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS AND CETA AGENCIES

Representing an important component of the CETA delivery system were proprietary schools and various community based organizations. Representatives from these organizations participated in each of the five regional workshops. Specifically, individuals from these organizations included: proprietary school owners, instructors, counselors, and program operators. As a result of this project, 27 individuals from these organizations had the opportunity to participate in the workshops and share their concerns with representatives from CETA, community colleges, and local education agencies. Their willingness to participate is documented proof of their effort to remain a viable component of the CETA skill training delivery system.

To foster and create viable CETA/Education Linkages within the Commonwealth, representatives from these two organizations identified and addressed a number of key issues and concerns as they related to their contractual obligations with various CETA funding agencies. In some instances the concerns/issues identified by both the proprietary schools and community based organizations were identical to those of the community colleges and local education agencies. However, the nature of both these organizations served as the basis for issues unique only to them. The issues and concerns that emerged as a result of the five regional workshops are identified on the following pages.

First, both organizations felt, as did the community colleges and local education agencies, that some type of advanced funding should be made available. This issue is critical if the contractor is forced to incur the initial expense until funding is approved. For proprietary schools forced to compete in a competitive market, this issue is especially critical.

Representatives of various CETA funding agencies recognized the nature of this problem. However, the nature of federal funding presently precludes any advanced funding.

Second, representatives from the proprietary schools indicated that only their training programs represented the true cost of educating CETA clients. Compared to other CETA contractors, the cost associated with proprietary school CETA training appears higher than some community based organizations and local education agencies. Even though the initial cost is higher, the services they provide makes them competitive. These services would include initial screening and counseling, employability training and job placement, and follow-up on an individual basis. Many community colleges and local education agencies also provide these services. However, their cost is usually supported through other funds.

CETA representatives indicated that while the true cost per trainee is important, the necessary supportive services are an essential component to any skill training program. While non-profit organizations can spread these costs and possibly provide training for lower cost per student than proprietary schools, this is not a particular disadvantage.

The representation and existence of proprietary schools makes them an ideal training agency. As a result of this perceived disadvantage, the following recommendations were made:

1. All CETA contracts should be evaluated on the "True" cost per student.

2. The reputation of proprietary schools as measured by existence and placement should be considered.

3. Program length and clock hours of instruction should serve to add credibility to proprietary schools.

4. Qualification and certification of proprietary school instructors should be considered when identifying the most qualified training program.

5. Awarding of contracts should not be made on a least cost system entirely. To do so would place proprietary schools at a definite disadvantage with community colleges and local education agencies.

Third, many of the proprietary school representatives indicated that CETA agencies did not have a clear understanding as to the types of programs and services they had to offer. As a result, unless the CETA agency had prior contracts with these institutions, they were reluctant to generate a cooperative training effort.

This concern was perceived by CETA representatives to have little significance. In general, while former contracted agencies have had the opportunity to document their credibility through client job performance, CETA agencies are always willing to contract with any organization willing to commit for quality service. Unless the contract provides for program duplication, the impact of new organization(s) vs old organizations is minimal. Recommendations made concerning this issue include:

1. A resource manual needs to be developed and distributed explaining the opportunities for creating effective linkages.

2. Prime sponsors and balance of state officials should conduct frequent local linkage workshops for all public and private schools in their area.

3. Communications between appropriate CETA and proprietary school representatives for the purpose of contract negotiations should be established and maintained.

4. Proprietary schools should provide CETA agencies and the Virginia Employment Commission (VEC) with specific information concerning a client's skill level and employability upon exit from the school.

Fourth, proprietary school representatives felt the need for involving proprietary schools in the decision-making process when awarding training contracts. Through this involvement, reputable proprietary schools could aid in protecting their public image by recognizing those private institutions having inferior programs. This concept is extremely important in light of the competitive nature of the proprietary school and recent negative publicity concerning misappropriation of funds of certain CETA funding projects.

While the CETA representatives recognized the conceptual value of this arrangement, it appeared difficult to protect themselves and the proprietary schools from potential conflict of interest charges. The feasibility of this concept was considerably valuable since in some instances CETA funding agencies were not adequately staffed to make decisions concerning a proprietary schools reputation.

Recognizing the need and value of this type of input, and weighing the consequences of its formation, the following specific recommendations were made:

1. Proprietary schools need to be involved in the governance and accreditation procedures.

2. Proprietary schools having high standards as measured by previous success can add credibility to CETA related projects.

3. Private employees are more receptive to hiring graduates from well known schools. Thus, funding projects with recognized proprietary schools increases placement of CETA clients.

4. By actively associating proprietary schools with various CETA agencies, a viable public relations program can be implemented increasing the credibility of both organizations.

A fifth issue identified by CETA representatives concerned the specialized curriculum offered by many proprietary schools. This specialization considerably reduces the amount of training contracts the school can receive while at the same time limiting the number of CETA clients that can take advantage of these opportunities.

In response, proprietary school representatives perceived this issue to be an advantage rather than a disadvantage. By offering a specialized curriculum, the proprietary school can hire technically competent instructors and place them in well-equipped laboratories. It was felt that once the CETA agencies recognized the advantages of the proprietary schools' curriculum, they would see the potential for quality training and provide additional support. Recommendations made concerning the specialized curriculum and technically competent faculty included:

1. Recognition on the part of CETA representatives that the competitive nature of proprietary schools mandates the hiring of technically competent faculty and the use of well-equipped laboratories.

2. Recognition that specialized curriculums tend to increase the quality of the instruction provided.

3. While proprietary schools do provide specialized curriculums, their specialization occurs in occupations where there is a demand. If not, CETA clients, as well as non-CETA clients, would not enroll and they could not continue to exist.

4. Proprietary schools were not designed to meet the training needs of all people. Consequently, they should be reviewed on the depth of their programs and not breadth.

A sixth concern identified by CETA representatives and directed toward proprietary schools deals with the perceived inadequate services provided by the proprietary schools to the CETA client. Specifically, this issue addressed such questions as:

1. Is CETA or the proprietary school responsible for the CETA clients?

2. Are proprietary schools only responsible for placement of the non-CETA client?

3. Do proprietary schools have an adequate counseling staff to meet the needs of the CETA-type client?

4. Do proprietary schools have an adequate staff to provide the CETA client with initial assessment?

5. If the purpose of proprietary schools is profit, do they willingly accept as many students as possible to increase their profit margin?

Inasmuch as the proprietary schools were involved with occupational training, it was their feeling that other workshop participants will be forced to address many of those same issues. An apparent lack of understanding and limited communication was perceived by the proprietary schools to be the major underlying cause for many of these allegations. A particularly sensitive issue was in the support service area. To be accurate, the proprietary schools felt client support should be viewed in three phases, rather than one. These phases should include: (1) Pre-training support services, (2) In-training support services, and (3) Placement and follow-up support services. The specific recommendations made as a result of this issue were founded on the concept that

proprietary schools were responsible to the needs of all students, CETA or non-CETA. These recommendations included:

1. Proprietary schools should willingly accept training responsibility for all students. However, placement efforts should be assumed by both the proprietary schools and the Virginia Employment Commission.
2. The charge of inadequate proprietary school support services for CETA clients is unfounded and totally inaccurate on three accounts.
   a. Pre-training Support Services:
      Unless CETA clients receive a quality assessment prior to being referred to a proprietary school little if any valuable assistance can be rendered to the CETA client by proprietary school staff. There is little reason to place the pre-training assessment in the hands of proprietary schools if the VEC does not fulfill their responsibilities.
   b. In-training Support Services:
      These services are considered to be part of the proprietary schools responsibility to their student. To say these services are insufficient based on counselor/client ratio is inappropriate since enrollments are constantly fluctuating; the specific CETA clients needs are difficult to predict in advance; proprietary schools do not have the necessary capital to hire additional staff and reduce the counselor/client ratio.
   c. Placement and Follow-up Support Services:
      Placement and follow-up support services have been and will continue to be an integral part of the services provided to both CETA and non-CETA clients by proprietary schools. This commitment however, does not relieve the VEC from any of their responsibilities. If anything, the placement and follow-up services provided by proprietary schools exceed those of other appropriate agencies since it serves as the basis for a school's continued existence.
3. The charge of increased clients for increased profit is unfair when directed entirely to proprietary schools. If profit is considered to be a gain over the initial investment then profit and non-profit organizations must have some record profit or they would cease to exist.

4. Inadequate support systems are sometimes identified when clients are sent to proprietary school without essential pre-requisite skills.
5. The responsiveness of proprietary schools to CETA clients could be increased if clients were made aware of their individual responsibilities by CETA officials prior to entering a skills training program.
6. Whether they be profit or non-profit institutions, the number of support services offered is directly proportional to the number of clients involved.
7. Responsiveness of proprietary schools to CETA clients could be enhanced by specifically commiting support services in all training agreements.
8. A key issue in proprietary school responsiveness and support services is assessment. Workshops should be held involving CETA agencies and contractor to plan and organize an effective assessment process.

ISSUES, STRATEGIES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LINKAGES BETWEEN COMMUNITY COLLEGES AND CETA AGENCIES

The Virginia Community College System had representation at each of the five regional workshops conducted. Individuals representing the community colleges included: deans, department heads, appointed program operators, and instructors. At the close of the project approximately 30 community college representatives had participated. This active workshop participation enabled the majority of these representatives to promote the capabilities of their respective institutions, and to obtain a better understanding of CETA operations and regulations (within prime sponsors and the balance-of-state).

The agenda at each of the five regional workshops provided community college representatives with the opportunity to collectively identify their concerns in working with various CETA agencies. As each of the workshops closed, a comprehensive list of issues was identified as being common throughout the state. These issues addressed a number of concerns and are identified below.

First, there was a general consensus that the various CETA agencies throughout the Commonwealth misunderstand the types and nature of those programs provided within the community college system. Specifically, while community colleges offered both certificate and degree programs and have a general education component, they also provided the skill training needed by the CETA client.

It appeared that few CETA prime sponsors and balance of state representatives were aware of the skill training component. In those cases

where CETA representatives were aware that they could contract solely for a skill training component, confusion existed concerning the procedures needed to purchase this service.

Collectively, recommendations were made and accepted that this issue needs to be addressed by both agencies. The initiative must be made to communicate the availability of this type of program. Specific recommendations included:

1. Identifying, in advance, those community college programs having content matching the specific needs of CETA clients.

2. Developing contracts with CETA agencies specifically establishing class size.

3. Individual Referral Programs should be conducted program-by-program only if the curricula meets CETA content and duration requirements.

4. General education courses (History, Philosophy, Sociology, etc.) are required in all degree programs at the community college by the state council on higher education. Inasmuch as they cannot be dropped, CETA clients should be issued certificates of competence rather than degrees or diplomas.

Second, the lack of apparent stability associated with CETA funds made long range program planning at the participating community college difficult, it not impossible. Because of this apparent instability, community college program operators can not hire staff and schedule facilities in advance. Additionally, community college administrators are reluctant to commit the necessary funds without assurances that the training program can be funded. These problems illustrate the need for accurate planning and effective management and is especially true when attempting to start programs on short notice.

CETA representatives acknowledged the perceived delay in funding programs but found themselves faced with the same dilemma. Inasmuch as all funds are channelled from the federal level, little can be done to speed up the bureaucratic funding process. The problem has continued as many CETA representatives participating in the workshops are still unaware of their budgets for FY 1980; only two months away!

The following specific recommendations were made addressing this issue:

1. Community colleges should plan to make increased utilization of existing faculty and facilities in anticipation of CETA clients.

2. "Start up" monies needed to establish CETA programs could be obtained by community colleges through various financial lending institutions.

3. The feasibility of a "special account" for community colleges should be reviewed for it's appropriateness to the conducting of CETA programs.

4. Current CETA legislation should be modified to provide "forward" money.

5. Short notice programs could be contracted as class size projects thus taking advantages of the community college flexibility.

Third, many community college representatives felt that both CETA agencies were quick to "hitch-hike" onto existent programs. This practice was perceived as an attempt to flood existent programs and facilities, designed for other target groups and built by non-CETA funds, with CETA clients. More importantly, once this circumstance occurred, CETA representatives felt they had sole program control and authority.

While CETA representatives agreed that the community recognition and acceptance of community colleges made them an ideal potential contractor, they did not perceive themselves as trying to gain control of the community college programs. The "hitch-hiking" issue made sense also as money saved in having additional staff and equipping new facilities could be used to support additional clients. Consequently, more unskilled and unemployed individuals could be trained and productively employed. Recommendations included:

1. Increased community college receptiveness is needed to accept the CETA client in skill classes with community college students.
2. Consideration should be given to the possibility of increasing "school operating hours" to include classes comprised solely of CETA clients.
3. Community college should recognize that the "flooding" of existing community college classes with CETA clients is not an attempt to gain control but speaks highly of community college programs.

Fourth, a difference in federal year (FY) funding cycles exists between community colleges (July 1 - June 30) and CETA agencies (October 1 - September 30). As a result, CETA projects and related staff are not funded until three months after budgets are operational or one month after schools have begun operation. This procedure not only makes planning difficult but requires that CETA clients start training programs a minimum of four weeks behind schedule.

While this concern does exist, CETA representatives felt this problem was not insurmountable. Recognizing that the chance of changing the DOL funding cycle to match that of HEW was non-existent, alternatives do exist that could help alleviate the impact of this problem.

1. The "open-entry"/"open-exit" concept could be incorporated into those community college programs having CETA clients.

2. CETA clients could be placed in community college programs at any time during the year and not just October 1.

3. Budgets could be developed on quarterly rather than FY basis.

4. Community colleges could work more closely with CETA and individual referral agencies to plan for the number of CETA clients entering a program.

Fifth, community college representatives felt that the recent wave of negative publicity surrounding CETA programs regionally and nationally tended to act as a "millstone around their neck". This publicity is especially critical since the community college system has widespread acceptance and recognition as creditable institutions. In many instances, the negative CETA publicity coupled with the high degree of paperwork associated with CETA programs tends to reduce the amount of community college involvement.

While the negative publicity associated with CETA programs is apparent, CETA representatives identified four points that must be considered:

1. Good news does not sell newspapers and increase circulation.

2. Bad news sells papers more effectively if it's on the front page.

3. While there is a considerable amount of paperwork associated with CETA programs, HEW-funded programs also involve a large quantity of paperwork.

4. There are many different components to the CETA legislation. Much of the negative publicity is the result of poor management and misappropriation

of funds of a few Public Service Employment (PSE) and on-the-job training (OJT) projects which are only a small part of the total CETA effort.

To reduce the widespread mistrust of CETA programs created as a result of negative publicity and to increase the willingness of community colleges to participate, the following recommendations were made:

1. Community colleges should work closely with CETA agencies to gain a detailed understanding of their operation.
2. Community colleges should assist CETA agencies in implementing a positive public relations effort.
3. By actively participating in appropriate CETA efforts, community colleges could use their acceptance and recognition to give CETA increased credibility.
4. Selected CETA representatives should develop a liason with the Vice-Chancellor of Academic and Student Affairs at the Virginia Community College System (VCCS).

Sixth, community colleges were perceived by CETA representatives to be too academically oriented. As a result, they tended to select only those students meeting entrance requirements. In many instances, this practice accounts for high dropout rates among CETA clients, or, in some cases, CETA clients are required to take remediation courses to ensure community college success.

While community colleges recognized that the charge of academic orientation was correct, they also provide education that was not academically oriented. The purpose of student screening was related

to academic programs and was essential for student success.

Recommendations relating to this matter included:

1. Increased funding should be provided for supportive services (ie., counseling, assessment and evaluation).

2. There should be an increase of screening for deficient skills of clients on the part of CETA agencies.

3. There should be a recognition that some CETA clients may not need remedial training.

4. There should be a recognition that community colleges can't be all things to all people.

5. There should be a recognition that community colleges are open for suggestions from any groups promoting additional education opportunities.

6. CETA agencies should become more familiar with community college entrance requirements.

Seventh, community colleges are required to operate programs on a full time equivalent (FTE) funding formula for reimbursement. The nature of this formula places pressure on the community college to view enrollments as full-time students taking credit hour courses. Part-time students do little to justify community college courses for reimbursement especially if these students are enrolled in non-credit courses. If community colleges are to exist and justify the need to maintain faculty, it must currently be done on the basis of the FTE funding formula. Consequently, community colleges are reluctant to accept part-time CETA clients enrolled in non-credit courses since they fill slots and cannot be used to justify the need for additional staff or facilities.

Few of the CETA representatives were aware of the FTE policy its total impact on the community college delivery system. Ironically,

the FTE system requires CETA representatives to buy services they neither want nor the clients need. The total procedure appears to contradict the CETA philosophy of providing clients with little, if any, academic preparation and emphasising short, intensive skill training. As a result, the following recommendations were made in an attempt to address this dilemma:

1. Since the FTE funding formula will remain, procedures should be identified to give special consideration to those community colleges participating in CETA projects.

2. The nature of the FTE funding dilemma necessitates an intense effort on the part of CETA representatives to address this issue through additional conferences, advisory meetings, and workshops.

3. The priority of this issue should be taken into consideration and addressed by high administrative levels within the State CETA and community college agencies.

ISSUES, STRATEGIES, AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF LINKAGES BETWEEN LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES AND CETA AGENCIES

The largest group participating in each of the five (5) regional workshops were representatives of various local education agencies (LEA). Representatives of this group included: Superintendents and Assistant Superintendents of Schools, Directors of Vocational Education, Coordinators of Federal Programs, Placement Officials, and Supervisors of Trade and Industrial Education. At the completion of the project a total of 108 local education agency representatives had participated in the workshop.

The heavy participation of local educational agencies was indicative of their present and anticipated involvement with CETA funded projects. As a result of this participation, valuable input was received from these individuals concerning program and individual needs, funding processes, request for proposal (REP) procedures, and accountability. Local education agency prior involvement served as the basis for much discussion concerning the creation of CETA/Education linkages. Specific issues concerning linkages were addressed by representatives from both CETA and local education agencies and are presented below. In some instances a few of the issues addressed were also identified by community colleges and proprietary schools. The composition and unique characteristics of the local education agencies, however, mandated that different solutions be found to create viable linkages.

One issue expressed by the representatives of local education agencies was their perception that CETA agencies do not really understand their goals and philosophy. Inasmuch as LEA programs are funded by local

public dollars their accountability rests primarily with this constitutency. As a result, LEA programs are designed primarily for the in-school youth in a community.

CETA representatives recognized this historical mandate however, they indicated their legislative mandate was to serve both out of school youth and the unskilled and unemployed adult. As a result of these two separate and distinct mandates, CETA representatives felt a workable solution needed to be identified and addressed by both parties. Basically while CETA funds could not be used to support LEA legislatively mandated programs, funds were available for additional programs meeting the needs of CETA clientele.

Recommendations addressing this issue included:

1. LEA and CETA representatives need to work together to identify those individuals not currently having their needs met.
2. There is a need to assess LEA facilities and staff and to develop additional programs to meet the needs of these CETA clientele.
3. There is a need to identify the political realities associated with LEA's and CETA, and develop arrangements meeting the needs of both.
4. CETA representatives need to provide some type of in-service training to the LEA.
5. CETA officials need to recognize and respect the LEA's focus on youth; however, LEA's must also be willing to meet the needs of adults as well.
6. An effort must be made to incorporate the short term training philosophy of CETA with the long term training programs of LEA's.

A second concern identified by LEA representatives involved the constant and time consuming process of monitoring through project

evaluation. As a result of this procedure, LEA program operators are constantly forced to spend time preparing for audits from two different agencies at different times during the year.

CETA representatives recognized that monitoring through audits was a hardship. However, program operators must be audited if they are to be held accountable. More importantly, auditing is also a part of any program supported by public funds. This includes both the Department of Labor (CETA Project) and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Both LEA and CETA representatives agreed that monitoring was necessary to prevent mismanagement of public funds. Disagreement concerned the nature of the auditing process. In this respect the following recommendations were made:

1. Appropriate CETA and LEA officials should review their respective auditing systems and develop a plan for uniformity.

2. LEA and CETA auditing dates should be established to occur almost simultaneously; thus, reducing the amount of preparation time required of the LEA program operator.

3. The requirement of maintaining separate records for both the LEA and CETA should be reviewed for duplication.

4. Specific auditing procedures for DOL and HEW should be reviewed and recommendations made to the appropriate national officials for consolidation of efforts.

5. There should be an increase auditing effort from a constructive point of view.

6. CETA agencies should provide information to LEA's explaining auditing procedures in simplified and easy to understand form.

The third concern was identified by various LEA representatives indicating that while they were willing to participate in CETA Skill

training activities, support from high level LEA administrators was sometimes weak. This minimal support is usually the result of LEA administrators not being fully informed as to what CETA is and how LEA's can assist in their efforts.

This problem was perceived by CETA representatives to be commonplace among the general public and not unique to the LEA's. The broad range effect of the current CETA legislation contributes to this apparent lack of misunderstanding. The amount of confusion concerning CETA legislation is intensified when viewing not only the eight (8) titles within the current legislation, but the special projects that may occur within each of the titles. Recommendations presented by the workshop participants included:

1. There should be an increase of public relations efforts concerning the total CETA program as mandated by federal legislation.

2. Local workshops should be conducted with high level LEA administration explaining the total CETA Act and its components.

3. Information should be provided that will publicize the technical assistance currently available from various CETA agencies to LEA's upon request.

4. An effort should be made to plan, implement, and conduct additional CETA/Education Linkage Workshops addressing concerns of LEA's dealing with specific CETA projects.

5. An effort should be made to develop and disseminate information to LEA's explaining:
   a. The purpose of CETA
   b. The types of programs provided by CETA
   c. How LEA's can become involved with CETA
   d. The eligibility requirements for the various programs funded through CETA monies.

A fourth concern addressed by LEA representatives dealt with the present RFP procedure used by various CETA agencies to award contracts. In many instances the LEA representatives felt that not only was uniformity lacking among these procedures, but the amount of time allowed LEA's to respond to the RFP was not long enough. As a result of this practice, LEA's did not have the time necessary to:

1. Develop, plan, and write quality proposals; or
2. Effectively plan and manage either facilities or staff.

While the current practice of using different proposal formats was recognized by CETA representatives, they felt there was a positive aspect of this procedure. This is, independent CETA funding agencies were better able to develop RFP's that both met their unique needs and allowed for the best possible review based on the qualifications of available staff. In response to the charge of adequate time allowed for responding to RFP's by LEA's, CETA officials recognized that this was a problem. However, to maintain the flexibility needed to be responsive to the changing and fluctuating local labor market needs, this practice was a necessity. Recommendations associated with this concern included:

1. Technical assistance activities should be conducted by CETA agencies explaining RFP procedures.
2. LEA representatives should provide input into the development of RFP procedures.
3. LEA's should have a representative that provides in-service training to selected individuals within their own organizations concerning CETA contract writing.

The fifth concern identified by LEA's was the apparent lack of specified criteria used by various CETA agencies in proposal review and evaluation. Disappointment was also expressed in that once a proposal

had been rejected, there was no general communication explaining the nature of the rejection. Consequently, CETA agencies were often perceived to be in a constant state of disorganization.

The CETA representatives appeared dismayed upon hearing of these concerns. Recognizing that each CETA funding agency preferred specific formats in RFP's, they had felt that these procedures were known to the LEA's. The reason for varying RFP's procedures among the various CETA agencies was to insure unique needs were adequately identified and addressed. It was also noted that each prime sponsor was a unique and separate administrative body with its own specific procedures. Concerning the issue of a lack of communication involving rejected proposals, the CETA representatives felt that this problem may be an exception and not the rule. It is common practice for all CETA funding agencies to include with the RFP package a checklist of criteria to be used in proposal review and evaluation.

In light of these LEA concerns, the following recommendations were made:

1. As much time as possible should be given to all LEA's to respond to RFP's.

2. Included in the CETA RFP package should be a list of criteria used in proposal review and evaluation.

3. Should an LEA proposal be rejected, CETA representatives should review upon request with LEA officials the criteria used as a basis for rejection.

4. Proposal evaluation criteria should be reviewed and modified as necessary to insure:
   a. the criteria is easily understood,
   b. the criteria matches the conditions of the proposal

5. CETA representatives should continue to hold "Information Seminars" for LEA's interested in contracting with CETA explaining:
   a. RFP procedures specific to that CETA agency,
   b. Evaluation and review criteria used to evaluate all proposals,
   c. anticipated RFP needs.

A sixth issue identified by CETA representatives dealt with the perceived lack of flexibility of LEA's concerning facilities, staff, and resources. Specifically, CETA clients were perceived to be receiving training not accurately meeting their needs.

LEA representatives were quick to respond that the lack of flexibility was a misconception on the part of participating CETA officials. Instead, the LEA representatives felt that their organizations could be more flexible than any other if they were permitted more control.

Recommendations associated with this concern included:

1. A greater pre-planning effort could resolve some of the problems associated with flexibility.
2. Earlier communication between CETA and LEA representatives could greatly increase facilities, staff, and equipment flexibility.
3. The charge of inflexibility applies only to selected LEA's.
4. Part of the "lack of flexibility" is attributed to LEA's setting priorities to meet their intended mission. CETA officials should be aware of these charges.

In addition to these six concerns, there were several other concerns identified by LEA's as important to their representatives. These concerns include:

1. Negative CETA publicity.
2. Differing fiscal years.
3. CETA philosophy of being concerned only with the economically unemployed.
4. CETA emphasis on short term skill training.
5. Lack of guaranteed funding.
6. Too many program restricitions.
7. Perceived common distrust between CETA agencies and CETA contractors.

Interestingly, these concerns were also addressed by representatives from the community colleges and proprietary schools/community based organizations. Inasmuch as the recommendations to these LEA concerns were similar to those of the other two groups, you are referred to those sections.

SUMMARY

The Comprehensive and Employment and Training Act specifically requires and contains provisions to include cooperative efforts between CETA and education agencies within the Commonwealth of Virginia. As a result of this legislation, local and state education agencies will undoubtedly find their role in the delivery of vocational programs to be significantly changed. As the result of the five regional workshops for CETA/Education linkages, it has become apparent that these potential changes are of strong concern to the vocational education community in Virginia. Local education administrators are very concerned about their role in the provision of employment, work experience, skill training, and opportunities for community services to eligible youths and adult who may qualify for CETA funding. Through the discussions of the workshops, it has become apparent that local education agencies have tremendous potential to provide counseling and career information, literacy training, bilingual education, attainment of high school equivalency certificates (GED), basic job skills training (ABE), child care training, skill training, job restructuring and transportation assistance. The problems that have arisen are not generally attributed to the abilities of the local education agencies to actually deliver services but instead seem to relate more commonly to misinformation, lack of understanding of CETA expectations, and a concern for the publicity potential of an involvement with CETA agencies. Almost universally the 250 participants associated with the CETA/Education linkage workshops have recommended and supported a need to amplify the communication processes currently being used by

the CETA agencies to describe and inform the various community agencies about CETA opportunities and the methods whereby they may become more involved in a coordinated effort to deliver CETA services. The various programs established under CETA provide incentives in the form of financial assistance to local education agencies. This source of funds will undoubtedly have a financial implication for local education agencies. Because of the form and purpose of the local education and state agencies involvement is variable, the nature of such implications and the area in which they will impact the educational system are important factors for consideration. The discussions derived from the CETA/Education linkage workshops suggest that there is a need to clarify and explore the implications of a local education agency involvement with CETA program areas most directly effecting the educational system. With such information, guidelines for future action by the local education agencies with respect to CETA may be developed and disseminated. The need for such information is emphasized throughout this proceedings document and should be recognized as a common concern of both CETA professionals and representatives of local education agencies.

In summary a number of different forces, generated by a variety of groups, having overlapping jurisdictions and potentially conflicting goals, may impact on the local and state education agencies as CETA programs move from conceptualization to the full implementation stages. CETA programs are designed to serve primarily unemployed youths and adults from disadvantaged backgrounds. Because of the individual needs of these various clients, improved collaborations between vocational

education and the employment and training systems requires knowledge and information on which to base informed program decisions. Many local educators lack the information necessary to develop co-sponsored programs (vocational education/CETA) to support the transition of youth and adults from schools to work and from the unemployed to the employed. Therefore, it is vital to identify and document effective mechanisms that may be used to facilitate cooperative and concerted efforts between local education and CETA agencies, and to dissiminate the findings to the field.

APPENDIX A

WORKSHOP PARTICIPANTS

PROPRIETARY SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITY BASED ORGANIZATIONS

David Bond
Fogg Technical Institute
Rt. 1
Hanover, VA 23069

Vivian S. Brandon
Brandon Secretarial College
3139 Williamson Road
Roanoke, VA 24012

Judy Davis
National Business School
3108 Mt. Vernon Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22305

Charles E. Ferguson
Industrial Career Center
2700 Jefferson Davis Highway
Richmond, VA 23234

George O. Fogg, Jr.
Fogg Technical Institute
Rt. 1
Hanover, VA 23069

William E. Gleason
Elizabeth Brant School of Business
Staunton, VA 24401

Mary Jo Greco
Career Education Representative
Control Data Institute
3717 Columbia Pike
Arlington, VA 22204

Eunice Hall
Phillips Business College
1112 Church Street
Lynchburg, VA 24505

Patricia A. Heft
Kee's Business College
1500 Norview Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23220

Bob Hodge
Richmond Business College, Inc.
613-15 N. Lombardy Street
Richmond, VA 23220

James Holland
Professional Business & Medical Institute
1600 E. Little Creek Road
Bel Aire Bldg., Suite 108
Norfolk, VA 23518

P.H. Hurst, Jr.
American Motel School
105 Campbell Avenue
Roanoke, VA 24034

Joseph A. Kennedy
Princess Anne Business College
2924 N. Lynnhaven Road
Virginia Beach, VA 23452

Frank E. Longaker
National Business College
8 Franklin Road
Roanoke, VA 24011

Gail McLeod
College of Hampton Roads
99 Sherwood Mall
Newport News, VA 23602

Lesson B. Mucholh, Dean
National Business College
8 Franklin Road
Roanoke, VA 24011

Richard C. Nininger, Director
National Business College
2246 Ivy Road, #15
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Richard R. Shurtz
American Transportation Institute
8224 Old Court House Road
Vienna, VA 22180

Carl F. Simmons
Computer Learning Center
6666 Commerce Street
Springfield, VA 22150

Joanne Simmons
Extended Learning Institute
8333 Little River Turnpike
Annandale, VA 22003

D. Gary Smucker
National Business School
3108 Mt. Vernon Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22305

Earle T. Steele
Steele's Welding School
116 Walton Avenue
Danville, VA 24541

James F. Teets
Columbia Technical Institute
112 South Wayne Street
Washington-Lee Center
Arlington, VA 22204

Herb Wittersheim
Automotive Training Institute
5700 Southern Blvd.
Virginia Beach, VA 23462

Community Based Organizations

Ann Rose
Center for the Alternative School Program
P.O. Box 234
Stephens City, VA 22655

John Tillerson
Arlington Chamber of Commerce
4600 North Fairfax Drive
Arlington, VA 22203

Joe Young
National Alliance of Business
2833 Williamson Road
Roanoke, VA 24012

Prudence Parks
National Alliance of Business
1129 20th Street
Washington, DC 20030

CETA PROFESSIONALS

Allan Bahache
Harrisonburg Regional Operations Center
1776 S. Main Street
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Raymond A. Boyd
Roanoke Corstorium for Manpower Services
145 W. Campbell Avenue
Roanoke, VA 24011

Howard Bullen
CETA Director
Economics Opportunity Commission
815 King Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Paul Clancey, Jr.
Director Manpower Staff
Peninsula Office of Manpower Programs
2017 Cunningham Drive, Suite 300
P.O. Box 7489
Hampton, VA 23666

Joanna H. Calytor
CETA Project Director
Rt. 1, Box 4-A
Floyd, VA 24091

Walter E. Coleman
CETA Administrator
Manpower Administration
County of Henrico
Byrd Center Office Complex
5651 South Laburnum Avenue
Richmond, VA 23231

Russel Crosier, Director
Fairfax County Skills Center
P.O. Box 466
Fort Belvior, VA 22060

Ray Davis
Warsaw Regional Operations Center
P.O. Box 896
Warsaw, VA 22572

Garney J. Day
Governor's Employment & Training Council Coordinator
145 W. Campbell Avenue
Crystal Tower Building
Roanoke, VA 24016

Sena Edwards, Director
Washington County Manpower Training Skills Center
Rt. 8, Box 11
Abingdon, VA 24210

Mel Fiel
Roanoke Regional Operations Center
403 West Campbell Avenue
Roanoke, VA 24016

Bill Gembach
Assistant Director
Wise County Vocational Training Skills Center
Wise, VA 24293

Michael Gilbert
Manpower Director
Suite 301, Law Building
4057 Chain Bridge Road
Fairfax, VA 22030

Gerald Gordon
Manpower Administrator
County Manpower Division
2100 14th Street, North
Arlington, VA 22201

Guy Griffin, Director
Southside Manpower Training Skills Center
P.O. Box 258
Crewe, VA 23930

Gerald D. Griswold
Regional Operations Center
P.O. Box 267
Abingdon, VA 24210

Donna M. Hicks
Contracting Officer
5135 C. Overland Drive
Roanoke, VA 24014

Donald K. King
Roanoke Consortium for Manpower Services
Crystal Towers Building
Roanoke, VA 24015

Kathy Larson
Countracting Officer Representative
CETA ROC
P.O. Box 267
Abingdon, VA 24210

Jim Lincoln
Area Planner
P.O. Box 869
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Alicia Lugo
Central Virginia OIC
P.O. Box 710
Charlottesville, VA 22902

Jack McComas
Executive Director
Southeastern Tidewater Area Manpower Authority
Janaf Shopping Center
P.O. Box 12072
Norfolk, VA 23502

Wade Morrison
Northern Virginia Skills Center
816 South Walter Reed Drive
Arlington, VA 22204

Olin Munpower
Contracting Officer Representative
CETA Regional Operations Center
P.O. Box 267
Abingdon, VA 24210

Joyce C. Osborne, Counselor
Scott County Vocational Center
Box 698
Gate City, VA 24251

Stuart Pope
Richmond OIC
21 East Leigh Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Sumner R. Pugh
Farmville Regional Operations Center
Drawer R
Farmville, VA 2390o

George Reed
Norfolk City Schools Skill Center
1830 Lindsay Avenue
Norfolk, VA 23504

Charles Stecker
Wise County Manpower Training Skills Center
Box 302
Norton, VA 24273

Sam Rhymer, Supervisor
Washington County Skills Center
Rt. 8, Box 11
Abingdon, VA 24210

Mary Jane Stinson
Farmville Regional Operations Center
Drawer R
Farmville, VA 23901

Ben Vorhies
Harrisonburg Regional Operations Center
1776 S. Main Street
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Sharon Waddell, Administrator
Roanoke Consortium of Manpower Services
Suite 301, Crystal Tower Building
145 West Campbell Avenue, 3rd Floor
Roanoke, VA 24014

Jim Webb
Buckroe Skills Center
710 Buckroe Avenue
Hampton, VA 23664

Wayne Wolfe
Abingdon Regional Operations Center
P.O. Box 267
Abingdon, VA 24210

STATE ADVISORY COUNCIL ON VOCATIONAL EDUCATION

Rufus W. Beamer
Executive Director
Virginia State Advisory Council on
Vocational Education
P.O. Box U
Blacksburg, VA 24060

George S. Orr
Research and Evaluation Consultant
Virginia State Advisory Council On
Vocational Education
217-C Draper Road
Blacksburg, VA 24060

Gabby Walker
Virginia State Advisory Council On
Vocational Education
Adult Education Services
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216

COMMUNITY COLLEGES

Dr. George B. Baughan
Piedmont Virginia Community College
P.O. Box 1A
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Dr. Carmine J. Bell
Administrative Assistant
Wytheville Community College
1000 East Main Street
Wytheville, VA 24382

Dr. Michael N. Bishara
Mine Machine Maintenance Program
Southwest VA Community College
Box SVCC
Richlands, VA 24641

Ralph Brown
Coordinator of Research & Planning
Central VA Community College
P.O. Box 4098
Fort Hill Station
Lynchburg, VA 24502

Donald L. Campbell
Assistant Director of Continuing Education
Canville Community College
1009 Bonner Avenue
Danville, VA 24541

Ronald L. Coleman, Director
Continuing Education & Federal Programs
Virginia Western Community College
3095 Colonial Avenue
Roanoke, VA 24015

Dr. John F. Cooper
Dean of Instruction
Patrick Henry Community College
P.O. Box 5311
Martinsville, VA 24112

Dr. H. Randall Edwards, President
New River Community College
P.O. Box 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

Dr. David R. Eyler
Blue Ridge Community College
P.O. Box 80
Weyers Cave, VA 24486

Dr. Victor B. Ficker
Mountain Empire Community College
P.O. Box 700
Big Stone Gap, VA 24219

Bill Greene, Director
Dabney S. Lancaster Community College
Rt. 60W
Clifton Forge, VA 24426

Dr. Diana D. Hardison
Coordinator of Research & Grants
Southwest Virginia Community College
Box SVCC
Richlands, VA 24641

Ronald W. Harriman
Placement Director
New River Community College
Drawer 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

Dr. Michael Hensley
Director of Continuing Education
New River Community College
Drawer 1127
Dublin, VA 24084

Lee Hickman
Marymount College of Virginia
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. Harold H. Hooper
Virginia Western Community College
P.O. Box 4195
Roanoke, VA 24015

Wendall Howlett
Coordinator of Student Special Services
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
P.O. Box 12084
Richmond, VA 23241

Robert L. Hutson
Rappahannock Community College
P.O. Box 1A
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Dr. Charles R. King
Southwest Virginia Community College
P.O. Box SVCC
Richlands, VA 24641

Harold Koenig
Eastern Shore Community College
P.O. Box C
Melfa, VA 23410

Dr. Maomi Lawhorn
Assistant Director of Continuing Education
J. Sargeant Reynolds Community College
P.O. Box 12084
Richmond, VA 23241

Dr. Lawrence V. Laugh
Wytheville Community College
1000 E. Main Street
Wytheville, VA 24382

Donald W. McCollum
Director of Student Services
Mountain Empire Community College
Drawer 700
Big Stone Gap, VA 24219

Dr. Louis Monroe
Tidewater Community College
State Rt. 135
Portsmouth, VA 23703

Dewitt Moore, Dean
Virginia Highlands Community College
Box 828
Abingdon, VA 24210

Arthur L. Moore, Chairman
Engineering & Industrial Technology
Mountain Empire Community College
Drawer 700
Big Stone Gap, VA 24219

Jane North
Program Coordinator
Dabney Lancaster Community College
Rt. 60 West, Box 610
Clifton Forge, VA 24422

Bill Rittenhouse
Patrick Henry Community College
P.O. Box 5311
Martinsville, VA 24112

Catherine Roller
Lord Fairfax Community College
P.O. Box E
Middletown, VA 22673

Dr. Emma W. Schulken, President
Virginia Highlands Community College
P.O. Box 828
Abingdon, VA 24210

William F. Stone
Coordinator of Public Relations
John Tyler Community College
U.S. 1-301
Chester, VA 23831

E. P. Tangman, Chairman
Engineering Technologies Division
Annandale Campus
Northern Virginia Community College
8333 Little River Turnpike
Annandale, VA 22003

Dr. Howard Taylor
Director of Career Planning &
Placement
Thomas Nelson Community College
P.O. Box 9407
Hampton, VA 23670

Dr. Robert Templin
Piedmont Virginia Community College
P.O. Box 1A
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Dr. William Ward
Director of Grant Research &
Development
Northern Virginia Community College
8333 Little River Turnpike
Annandale, VA 22003

L.D. Wheatcraft
Germanna Community College
P.O. Box 339
Locust Grove, VA 22508

LOCAL EDUCATION AGENCIES

Elvin Adams
York County Schools
302 Dare Road
Graton, VA 23692

Martha G. Akers
Supervisor of Community Education
Roanoke City Schools
P.O. Box 13145
Roanoke, VA 24031

Fred J. Arwood
Vocational Director
Scott County Schools
Gate City, VA 24251

Larry Ashby
Vocational Director
Buchanan County Schools
Box 833
Grundy, VA 24614

William Barlow
Director of Vocational Education
Isle of Wight County Schools
Isle of Wight, VA 23397

Joy C. Bell
Brunswick County Schools
P.O. Box 309
Lawrenceville, VA 23868

Joseph A. Berryman
Director of Vocational Education
Campbell County Schools
P.O. Box 99
Rustburg, VA 24588

Louis H. Blakely
Goochland County Schools
P.O. Box 39
Goochland, VA 23063

Wayne Booth
Montgomery County Schools
P.O. Box 29
Christiansburg, VA 24073

Sandy Brandt
Human Resource Development Team
Suite 212
Janif Executive Center
Norfolk, VA 23502

Jerry Browder
Richmond City Schools
301 N. Ninth Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Arnold R. Burten
Roanoke County Schools
526 S. College Avenue
Salem, VA 24153

Mary Litis Burton
Secondary Supervisor
330 N. Court Avenue
Covington, VA 24426

Anthony Carrier
Cleveland Junior High School
P.O. Box 66
Cleveland, VA 24225

C. Bruce Chandler
Wythe County Schools
Wytheville, VA 24382

Zack Christian
Personnel Coordinator
Newport News City Schools
Box 6130
Newport News, VA 23606

L. Joe Chapman, Principal
Scott County Vocational Center
P.O. Box 698
Gate City, VA 24251

Kent Clark, Director
Vocational Education
Prince William County Schools
P.O. Box 389
Manassas, VA 22110

Ron Clark
Rehabilitative School Authority
110 S. Seventh Street
Richmond, VA 23219

Robert Coates
Coordinator of Vocational Education
Prince George County Schools
Box 8
Prince George, VA 23875

Cathy Cockrill
Fairfax County Public Schools
6131 Willston Drive
Falls Church, VA 22044

Daniel Colaw
Warren County Public Schools
Box 1089
Front Royal, VA 22530

Howard A. Collins
Albemarle County Schools
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Frank A. Cosby
Covington City Schools
340 W. Walnut Street
Covington, VA 24426

C. E. Darnell
Clifton Forge City Schools
P.O. Box 612
Clifton Forge, VA 24422

William G. Davis
Galax City Schools
P.O. Box 855
Galax, VA 24333

Kenneth J. Dobson
Pulaski County Schools
Box 231
Pulaski, VA 24301

Dale Dodrill
Rockingham County Public Schools
304 County Office Building
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

William C. Dudley
Page County Schools
Luray, VA 22895

Paul Dugger
Vocational Director
Virginia High School
Long Crescent Drive
Bristol, VA 24201

David Dunn
Director of Vocational Education
Halifax County Schools
P.O. Box 805
Halifax, VA 24558

Robert L. Dunn
Giles County Schools
Rt. 1, Box 86
Pearisburg, VA 24134

Harry Foglesong
Director of Instruction
Pulaski County Schools
701 N. Jefferson Avenue
Pulaski, VA 24301

Paul Foster
Director of Classified Personnel
P.O. Box 13145
Roanoke, VA 24031

Kenneth B. Frank
Staunton City Schools
Box 2626
Staunton, VA 24401

Dr. Charles B. Franklin
Radford City Schools
1612 Wadsworth Street
Radford, VA 24141

Charles J. Franks
Director of Vocational Education
Pittsylvania County Schools
Box 232
Chatham, VA 24531

Levi Galloway
Super. of Vocational Education
Franklin City Schools
800 W. Second Avenue
Franklin, VA 23851

Fred Gillispie
Lynchburg, City Schools
Box 1599
Lynchburg, VA 24505

Robert Glacken
Director of Continuing Education
Charles City County Schools
Rt. 2, Box 2
Charles City, VA 23030

Jim O. Graham
Wise County Schools
Box 1217
Wise, VA 24293

Denise Green
Norfolk City Schools
Box 1357
Norfolk, VA 23510

Elwood Hall
Albemarle County Schools
310 County Office Bldg.
Charlottesville, VA 22901

Robert Harper, Director
Adult & Vocational Education
Alexandria City Schools
418 South Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22313

R. Kent Harris
Pittsylvania County Schools
Box 232
Chatham, VA 24531

Dr. Henry Harrison
Director of Vocational Education
Halifax City Public Schools
Halifax, VA 24558

Sidney Harvey
Director of Instruction
Box 219
Independence, VA 24328

Frank Hayden
Newport News City Schools
Box 6130
Newport News, VA 23606

Gary Helbert
Nelson County Schools
Lovingston, VA 22949

James E. Hodges
Grayson County Schools
P.O. Box 219
Independence, VA 24348

Ray L. Hollandsworth
Floyd County Schools
Rt. 1, Box 4-A
Floyd, VA 24091

William J. Hopkins
Director of Instruction
Sussex County Schools
Sussex, VA 23890

James P. Horton
Scott County Schools
Box 307
Gate City, VA 24251

Charles S. Huntley, Jr.
Colonial Beach Schools
315 Douglas Avenue
Colonial Beach, VA 22443

Rudy Johnson
Work Experience Coordinator
Henry County Schools
P.O. Box 958
Collinsville, VA 24078

Same M. Johnson
Rockbridge County Schools
417 Morningside Drive
Lexington, VA 24450

Barbara Jones
Director Adult Education
Warwick High School
Newport News, VA 23601

Lester L. Jones
Tazewell County Schools
Box 469
Tazewell, VA 24651

Dr. Rick Logan
Warren County Schools
Box 1089
Front Royal, VA 22630

Thomas Mayberry
Director, Federal Programs
Galax City Schools
P.O. Box 855
Galax, VA 24333

Dr. Maynard R. Joyce
Bland County Schools
Box 218
Bland, VA 24315

Richard E. Lee
Amherst Schools
P.O. Box 469
Amherst, VA 24521

Jack Lewis
Danville Public Schools
313 Municipal Bldg.
Danville, VA 24541

Robert G. McCoy
Lee County Schools
Box 98
Jonesville, VA 24263

Susan McDonald
Rockingham County Schools
304 Office Building
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Mr. Morrison
Arlington County Schools
1426 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Michael Morrison
Fredrick County Schools
Coordinator Federal Programs
36 Whitlock Avenue
Winchester, VA 22601

David C. Musick
Russell County Schools
Lebhana, VA 24266

Joseph Myers
Harrisonburg City Schools
Box 551
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

J. W. Obenshain
Botetourt County Schools
Fincastle, VA 24090

William I. Overby, Jr.
Clarke County Schools
P.O. Box 351
Berryville, VA 22611

E. Mark Pace
Alleghany County Schools
330 N. Court Avenue
Covington, VA 24426

Dr. M. D. Pack
Roanoke City Schools
Box 13145
Roanoke, VA 24031

Barbara D. Page
Career Counseling Coordinator
1760 Boulevard
Salem, VA 24153

Hugh C. Palmer
Director of Vocational Education
Henrico County Schools
P.O. Box 40
Highland Springs, VA 23075

Matthew Pasquale
Supervisor Adult Education
Alexandria City Schools
418 S. Washington Street
Alexandria, VA 22313

William B. Peterson
Martinsville City Schools
Box 5548
Martinsville, VA 24112

Larkin C. Phillips
Director of Vocational Education
Hanover County Schools
200 Berkley Street
Ashland, VA 23005

Dr. Rollie T. Phillips
Carroll County Schools
Box 456
Hillsville, VA 24343

Elmer Pritt
Patrick County Schools
P.O. Box 346
Stuart, VA 24171

Earl Pulley, Director
Federal Programs
Fairfax County Schools
10700 Page Avenue
Fairfax, VA 22030

Royce W. Quarles
Superintendent
Bristol City Schools
222 Oak Street
Bristol, VA 24201

Dr. B. G. Raines, Superintendent
Washington County Schools
Drawer G
Abingdon, VA 24210

Linville G. Reed
Director of Instruction
P.O. Box 1217
Wise, VA 24293

Miles A. Reid
King-William-West Point County Schools
King William, VA 23086

Curtis A. Richardson
Danville City Schools
313 Municipal Building
Danville, VA 24541

Dr. John R. Rose
Manassas City Schools
9108 Church Street
Manassas, VA 22110

Dr. Arnold J. Saari
Superintendent
Montgomery County Schools
P.O. Box 29
Christiansburg, VA 24073

Earl R. Savage
Superintendent
Craig County Schools
P.O. Box 245
New Castle, VA 24137

Roger Sharp
Galax City Public Schools
P.O. Box 855
Galax, VA 24333

Ashby L. Shifflett, Jr.
Rockingham County Schools
304 County Office Building
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Irene Small
Newport News City Schools
Box 6130
Newport News, VA 23606

Claudette Smith
Surry County Schools
Box 317
Surry, VA 23883

Ronald M. Sokol
Giles County Schools
Rt. 1, Box 86
Pearisburg, VA 24134

Henry T. Stallard
Superintendent
Norton City Schools
Box 498
Norton, VA 24273

Fred F. Stickley
Superintendent
Dickenson County Schools
Clintwood, VA 24228

Dr. Tommy H. Street
Superintendent
Buchanan County Schools
Box 833
Grundy, VA 24614

Robert Suber
Director of Vocational Education
Hampton City Schools
P.O. Box 370
Hampton, VA 23669

Ed Szepela
Hampton City Schools
P.O. Box 370
Hampton, VA 23669

Bernard Talley,
Assistant Superintendent
Carroll County Public Schools
Hillsville, VA 24343

E. R. Thompson
Superintendent
Smyth County Schools
Drawer 987
Marion, VA 24354

Winston L. Underwood
Director of Vocational Education
P.O. Box 309
Fincastle, VA 24019

Dr. Vinable
Halifax City Schools
Halifax, VA 24558

William T. Wade, Jr.
Green County Schools
P.O. Box 127
Standardsville, VA 22973

Morris Whitten
Wythe County Schools
P.O. Box 554
Wytheville, VA 24382

Charlie Williams
Petersburg City Schools
141 Wythe Street
Petersburg, VA 23803

Robert C. Wright
George Washington High School
701 Broad Street
Danville, VA 24541

STATE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Flo Armstrong
State Department of Education
Employment & Training Services
Richmond, VA 23216

Dr. Lynn Barrier
Assistant State Supervisor
Industrial Arts
P.O. Box 5171
Roanoke, VA 24012

Lydia Bell
State Supervisor of Business Education
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216

Dick Buffington
State Department of Education
Employment & Training Services
Richmond, VA 23216

William Bursley
P.O. Box 284
Abingdon, VA 24210

George Byers
State Department of Education
Employment & Training Services
Richmond, VA 23216

Ron Chandler
State Department of Education
Employment & Training Services
Richmond, VA 23216

Leo F. Crawley
Department of Education
Post-Secondary Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Doris DeVries
Disadvantaged and Handicapped Program Services
Richmond, VA 23216

Linda Dressler
Virginia Department of Welfare
8007 Discovery Drive
Richmond, VA 23208

Carolyn Driver
Home Economics Supervisor
P.O. Box 427
Harrisonburg, VA 22801

Leona Eastwood
Health Occupations Education
Riverside Hospital
Newport News, VA 23601

Leonard S. Ferrara
Assistant Director
Virginia Employment Commission
CETA Division
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

Melvin Garner
Virginia State Department of Education
Administrative Director, Vocational Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Lee Garrett
State Department of Education
Employment & Training Services
Richmond, VA 23216

Anthony Gaudio
Administrative Assistant
P.O. Box 26963
Richmond, VA 23216

Maude Goldston
Supervisor Personnel BEvelopment
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Earl Gray
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

Rebecca Guthrie
Center for the Alternative School Programs
P.O. Box 234
Stephens City, VA

Gerald Gwiswald
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

Betty Hawa
State Department of Education
Sex Equity Coordinator for Vocational Education
P.O. Box 6A
Richmond, VA 23216

James R. Hawks
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

Vance M. Horne, Supervisor
Disadvantaged and Handicapped Services
Virginia State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Tom Hughes
State Department of Education
Industrial Arts
Richmond, VA 23216

Robert G. Lawson
Deputy Commissioner
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1358
Richmond, VA 23211

Robert McKinney
Virginia Employment Commission
403 W. Campbell
Roanoke, VA 24015

Lennox McLendon
Adult Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 60
Richmond, VA 23216

Dewey Oakley
Director Program Services
Virginia State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Frank M. Peele
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Art Quiroz
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

William C. Pursley
Assistant State Supervisor
Adult Education
P.O. Box 284
Abingdon, VA 24210

Kristan Shores
Virginia Employment Commission
P.O. Box 1300
Richmond, VA 23210

Jean Smallwood
State Department of Education
State Proprietary School Advisory
Council
5612 Indigo Road
Richmond, VA 23230

Dorothy Stone
State Department of Education
Richmond, VA 23216

Horace Webb
State Department of Education
Adult Education
P.O. Box 6Q
Richmond, VA 23216

APPENDIX B

SUMMARY

WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Name of Workshop Five Regional CETA/Education Linkage Workshops

Name of Workshop Leader(s) _____

Date _____

DIRECTIONS:

You are requested to read each item carefully and to respond as frankly as possible. Your honest appraisal will help us to improve future conferences.

Make a check mark in the space provided which most closely represents your response to each statement.

SA (1) -- Strongly Agree
A (2) -- Agree
N (3) -- Neutral
D (4) -- Disagree
SD (5) -- Strongly Disagree

	SA 1	A 2	N 3	D 4	SD 5
1. The purpose and objectives of the workshop were clearly made known to me at the beginning of the workshop.	45%	47%	3%	5%	0%
2. The workshop presentors were well prepared.	45%	49%	6%	0%	0%
3. The workshop leader(s) showed expertise in the overall management of the workshop.	52%	46%	2%	0%	0%
4. The workshop leader(s) demonstrated an ability to establish rapport in the group.	63%	32%	3%	2%	0%
5. The workshop was organized in a systematic and logical manner.	47%	45%	7%	0%	1%
6. A variety of methods and techniques was used in presenting and discussing the materials.	18%	49%	22%	10%	1%
7. The subject of CETA/Education Linkages was covered in sufficient depth for the purposes of this workshop.	26%	50%	14%	9%	1%

	SA 1	A 2	N 3	D 4	SD 5
8. My knowledge and interest of CETA/ Education Linkage have increased as a result of attending this workshop.	38%	56%	6%	0%	0%
9. I have gained an understanding of how to practically apply what I learned in this workshop.	10%	52%	26%	11%	1%
10. Workshop participants had an opportunity to ask questions and discuss pertinent issues.	68%	31%	1%	0%	0%
11. The workshop leader was reasonably objective in expressing his/her views and acknowledged the views of workshop participants.	54%	39%	4%	3%	0%
12. Workshop activities were relevant and productive to my learning.	30%	61%	8%	1%	0%
13. The amount of time allotted to the workshop was sufficient.	34%	54%	3%	8%	1%
14. I thought the workshop was interesting and informative.	43%	49%	6%	2%	0%
15. I felt the workshop achieved the purpose for which it was intended.	37%	43%	16%	3%	1%
16. The workshop seemed to be a useful vehicle to use in the creation and enhancement of CETA/Education Linkages.	47%	46%	5%	2%	0%
17. I would recommend this workshop to others.	50%	40%	9%	1%	0%

If not, please explain: _____

_____

_____

_____